

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 1-7 remain pending in the application subsequent to entry of this Amendment.

One of the characterizing features of claim 8 has been incorporated into claim 1 rendering claim 8 indefinite which has been canceled. This Amendment in effect removes the rejections stated in items 5 and 6 of the Official Action (in which claim 8 was not involved) and leaves for consideration only the rejection in item 8 of the Official Action, namely the combination of Levy in view of Kurahashi et al.

The statements in support of the rejection stated in items 8-9 of the Action focus on the presence of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) and other components, hydrocarbon wax in the case of Levy and melaminecyanuric acid adduct (MCA) in the case of the Kurahashi citation.

The rejection and statements in support of same however fail to take into account the wording of claim 1, namely that a required component is 5-30% by volume of polyethylene resin. The PTFE material disclosed in both of the citations is far different from polyethylene resin as will be well apparent to one skilled in this art and the two are not interchangeable insofar as the invention of the present application is concerned. Further, neither of the applied references focuses on the use of polyethylene resin; Kurahashi et al is totally silent as to polyethylene resin whereas Levy refers to a wide range of “dry lubricants applied as thin coatings or as particulate materials ...” in paragraph [0011] discussing the background of the invention and description of related art.

The use of solid or particulate organic lubricants is contained in paragraph [0091], a passage of the cited document to which the examiner refers but there is no particular reason to select one component over the other according to Levy’s disclosure. In particular, neither reference nor their combined teachings suggest a solid lubricant having as required ingredients the requisite quantities of polyethylene resin, hydrocarbon-based wax and melamine cyanurate as required by the claims of the present application.

The Official Action in item 9 refers to solid lubricants “present at from 0.001 up to about 99% by weight of the composition” but does not point to any particular passage of the 21 pages of the Levy reference from where this information may be obtained if in fact the examiner is referring to the discussion in paragraph [0100], counsel notes that this is related to a “super

YAMAMOTO
Appl. No. 10/535,495
June 14, 2010 (Monday)

absorbent polymer” which Levy refers to generally in the discussion beginning at paragraph [0080] and not PTFE and/or hydrocarbon wax according to applicants’ understanding of the Levy reference.

Again, applicants wish to emphasize that there is some confusion as between PTFE and polyethylene resin -- the two are not the same or interchangeable, polyethylene resin is a requirement of the compositions of the claims of the present application and is not disclosed or suggested in a particular three component (or more) combination of polyethylene resin, hydrocarbon-based wax and melamine cyanurate and in the amounts featured in the claims of the present application.

Reconsideration and favorable action are solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 14-1140.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Arthur R. Crawford/
Arthur R. Crawford
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:caw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100